



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Studies in the Diction of the Psalter

### First Article

WALDO S. PRATT

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE purpose of these Studies is not to discuss afresh the whole critical problem of the Psalter, but to present certain facts bearing upon that problem which seem not to have attracted much notice, though apparently of some importance. It is proposed simply to give summaries of certain phenomena in the vocabulary and lexical usage of the Psalter, and to consider questions as to their possible relation to its literary history.

Much of the matter to be presented is statistical, involving close attention to minutiae, and the entire discussion belongs to a class of critical investigations that is not always highly esteemed for other reasons than its intricacy. It is only fair to say that the pursuit of this kind of inquiry, certainly on so extensive a scale, was not originally in the writer's mind. As it was taken up for experiment, however, and subjected to prolonged testing, it has seemed to have enough validity and suggestiveness to warrant pressing it to conclusions, so that its results may be compared with those reached in other ways.

The tendency of Psalter commentation has been to be strongly subjective. This does not mean that it has usually been dominated by an obtrusive personal bias or prejudice, though these have not always been avoided, but simply that, owing to the inherent peculiarities of the problem, much has been made of presuppositions or assumptions, or, at least, of canons derived from the critic's mere feeling or instinct. The trained instinct is surely a valuable implement of research, but it commands confidence only when exercised in close contact with the ob-

served facts and with all the facts that merit observation. Our main object here is to add to the store of such facts. These, if correctly recorded and fairly appraised, lead on toward conclusions. Whether the inferences that are here suggested are reasonable remains to be seen. All that is claimed for these Studies is that they represent an attempt to pursue a course of genuinely scientific induction, with emphasis always upon objective phenomena as basal to and directive of the reasoning.

It is surprising that no elaborate studies seem to have been made in the vocabulary and diction of the Psalter. The fact that the Psalter is apparently a composite collection would naturally suggest such studies, since delicate lexical tests have often proved helpful in analyzing diverse materials. In applying these, it is important to remember that the compositeness of the Psalter probably has several aspects. Different poems may come from very different sources. Whole groups of poems may represent periods and circumstances. Individual poems may be made up of independent sections, or may have been subjected to considerable emendation or interpolation. The detection and classification of these heterogeneous materials should not be left to critical intuition, but, if possible, should be connected with some line of objective analysis. Although lexical tests are seldom demonstrative, yet they supply invaluable hints that may be taken as a basis of argument.

These Studies will be confined to the following topics:— (a) Some general summaries of the Psalter vocabulary, with notes on the relative frequency of the words and on their distribution among the poems and groups of poems; (b) A special investigation of what will be called the “liturgical” vocabulary, with inferences from its distribution;<sup>1</sup> (c) A similar treatment of the vocabulary of the “David” poems; (d) A similar treatment of the Elohistic division of the collection; (e) Some notes upon other topics more or less involved in the foregoing.

<sup>1</sup> The main points in the discussion of the first two topics have already been embodied in an article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January, 1913. These are here restated with greater elaboration of some details, so as to be directly accessible for comparison with similar details under the other topics.

In vocabulary studies it is usually necessary first of all to try to establish a rectified text. Particularly would this seem indispensable in the case of the Psalter, the text of which is rather notoriously doubtful in many places. Yet, for the precise purposes here in view, this extremely difficult task can be largely avoided, since it proves that most of the corrections that would most naturally be made have but slight effect upon the statistics that are chiefly used, and since, when it is a cardinal principle to eliminate subjective factors, the very subjective process of textual emendation is out of place, certainly at the outset. When one is seeking for clues as to the history of the received text as it stands, any emendation runs the risk of obliterating or distorting significant evidence.

There is, I think, no satisfactory separate vocabulary of the Psalter. Hence the student must either make it up direct from the text, or collate it from trustworthy general concordances. In the present case the latter course was followed, and this has proved satisfactory for the immediate purposes.<sup>2</sup>

If we omit the captions, the four benedictions at the end of Bks. I—IV, סלה, and the inseparables, the ordinary text of the Psalter comprises about 18,400 words.<sup>3</sup> In examining the distribution of certain words, it is useful, also, to set aside the formulae הללויה (at the opening or close of a poem) and כי לעולם חסדו (as in Ps. 136).

As ordinarily counted, the vocabulary from which the text is made up contains about 2,150 words, though, of course, opinions would vary as to how far closely related forms should be separated or combined. In estimating this total, also, considerable variation would result as soon as corrections or emendations of the text were admitted. For preliminary purposes,

<sup>2</sup> In English there are two Vocabularies, that of Arthur S. Fiske (Hartford, privately printed, 1887) and that of George A. Alcock (London, Elliot Stock, 1903). The former is a mere word-list, without citation of passages; it is almost complete and very accurate. The latter aims to cite all the passages and furnish some other information, but is defective and not above criticism in other regards.

<sup>3</sup> Inseparables combined with a pronoun, so as to make a separate word, appear in about 470 cases, raising the above total towards 19,000.

however, it proves convenient and safe to use the ordinarily accepted list as it stands.

A very large number of these words occur but a few times each. Thus nearly 900 are found only in single poems, and about 1,000 more occur in not more than twelve poems. There are about 235 words that occur with relative frequency—in more than twelve poems. Throughout the present study these latter are called “common,” while the rest are called “rare.” Taken by themselves, the “common” words make up about 68 % of the entire text and the “rare” words about 32 %.

The gradation from words that are “common” to those that are “rare” is, of course, continuous. Where to draw the line between the two classes is a question, and any separation must be arbitrary. The fixing of the dividing-point at *twelve* poems was made after considerable experimentation, and seems to have practical utility.

Classification by the number of *poems* in which the words occur, rather than by the total number of occurrences, is obviously wise, since mere repetitions within a given poem are much less significant than appearances in independent poems. Exact arrangement, however, is made difficult by the fact that “doublets” of the same passages are found, for which in some cases allowance ought to be made.

For convenience of reference, we here insert the list of “common” words, as thus secured, arranging them, as nearly as may be, in ten groups, beginning with those found in the largest number of poems, and ending with those found in only thirteen poems (these latter lying close to the arbitrary line drawn between “common” and “rare” words):

A	B	C	D	E
In 57—130	41—54	33—40	27—32	24—26
poems	poems	poems	poems	poems
אֵל	אָדָם	בָּטַח	אֲדָנִי	אֱהָב
אֱלֹהִים	אֵיב	בֵּית	אִישׁ	אָם
אָמַר	אֵין	בָּרַךְ	אִמַּת	נָם
אֶרֶץ	אֵל	נָוִי	אֶנֶּה n.	הֵם
אֶת (acc.)	אֵל	יָרַךְ	יָכַר	הִנֵּה
אָתָּה	אֲנִי	הוּא	דֹּר	יָחַד
הִיָּה	אֲשֶׁר	הֶלֶךְ	הָרָה	יָלַךְ
יָד	בּוֹא	הֵלֵל II.	זָכַר	יָם
יָדַע	בֵּן	חִיָּה n.	זָמַר	יַעֲקֹב
יְהוָה	דָּבָר	יָרָא v.	יָמִין	לָבַב
יוֹם	תָּסַד	יִשְׂרָאֵל	יָצָא	מָאֵד
כִּי	טוֹב adj.	יִשׁוּעָה	לָשׁוֹן	מַעַן

A	B	C	D	E
In 57—130 poems	41—54 poems	33—40 poems	27—32 poems	24—26 poems
כל	ידה	ישע	מי	מעשה
לא	ישב	כבוד	נגד	נמה
לב	מה	כון	נצל	נפל
נפש	עד conj.	מים	ספר	עבר
נתן	עין	מלך	עז	עבר
עולם	פה	משפט	צדיק	עמד
על	I. קרא	נשא	צדק	I. ענה
עם	רע	עם	ציון	רגל
עשה	רשע	קדש	I. ראש	n. רוח
פנה	שמה	קול	רום	שום
ראה	שמים	קום	שנא	
שם	שמע	רב		
		שוב		
		שמר		
F	G	H	I	J
In 21—23 poems	19—20 poems	16—18 poems	14—15 poems	13 poems
אבר	אכל	אביון	אהל	אב
און	אשר	אור n.	און	אור v.
און	את prep.	אנוש	אף conj.	ברית
אש	בוש	בל	בין	גבורה
גדול	בקש	גיל v.	בקר	זה
חנן	חסה	דם	בשר	חמה
חסיד	ירא adj.	דרש	גדל	חרפה
יה	ירד	זאת	חיה v.	כנור
כן adv.	ישר	חשב	חפץ v.	כסה
לילה	כמו	מות n.	חרב	v. מות
עון	כף	מן	ישע	מרום
עלה	מוט v.	נגד	כלא	מרמה
עני	מלא v.	נחלה	לחם	נהר
פלא	סתר	עוד	מגן	נצח
פעל	עד n.	פתח	מצא	נצר
צדקה	עליון	צר II.	נבט	עוב
צרה	עת	שכר	נחה	עצם
רנן	צור	שכח	סבב	עתה
שפח	קרב	שבן	סביב	צאן
שיר v.	שבע	שלם	עזר	צוה
שית v.	שלום	שם	עיר	רנה
שלח	תפלה	תמיד	צבא	רעע II.
שפט			רדף	תחת
תהלה			שואל	
			שחה	

Average total number of occurrences of each word:—

A. 190 B. 75 C. 56 D. 44 E. 35 F. 29 G. 25 H. 22 I. 19 J. 17

Taken together, these 236 words occur about 12,275 times, averaging over 50 times for each word.

If the purpose here were the drafting of a critically satisfactory vocabulary, the above list would need considerable sifting, and various questions as to meaning and usage would at once present themselves. But it will be found that even so rough a list as this can be employed for certain forms of analysis without danger of serious error. One of the first things to be examined is the question whether a separation cannot be made (by the use of objective criteria) between those parts of the Psalter that are relatively peculiar, individual or singular and those that are relatively conventional or formal. In some way we need to get at a standard within the Psalter itself. This standard can be tentatively determined by using the above list of "common" words as a basis for statistical analyses.

There is wide variation among the poems as to the proportion in their text of the words here called "rare." If they were all of about the same texture, the proportion of "rare" words would not be far from 33 % in all cases. But, on examination, we find that some poems show much higher percentages than this, rising in a few cases above 50, while others show very low percentages, falling in one case to 0. Of course, where the percentage of "rare" words is high, that of "common" words is low, and *vice versa*. And not only is there variation in the percentages, but the distribution of the poems that are "strong" (in "rare" words) and those that are "weak" is suggestive. The only way to exhibit this latter point is through some sort of diagram, but the mere figures of the percentages can be set down in a table, as follows:

Percentages of Rare Words in the Several Psalms.					
%	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
52	—	58, 60, 65	—	—	—
48	—	—	—	—	129
46	19	—	—	91	—
45	—	51	—	—	—
43	2	45, 68	—	—	150
42	23	—	78, 83	—	107, 114, 137
41	—	—	—	—	108, 132, 139

%	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
40	17, 39	—	76, 80	104	144, 147
39	11, 18, 35	69	—	—	124
38	8, 40	—	73, 77	106	126, 149
37	—	64	—	105	110
36	22	50, 70	74, 88, 89	93, 94	119
35	6	55, 72	75, 79	90	127
34	10	62	—	—	—
33	7	—	81	—	—
32	15, 29, 32, 38	44, 49	—	92, 102	109, 122
31	5, 12, 37	42, 46, 63	87	103	140
30	1, 16, 26, 31, 36	57, 59	—	—	133, 141
29	—	48	—	—	142
28	25	—	82	101	116, 148
27	4, 20	43, 52	84	95, 98	111, 112, 120
26	9, 30, 33	71	—	96	123
25	13, 27	—	—	—	—
24	28, 41	53	—	100	128, 146
23	21	—	—	97	131, 135
22	—	61, 66	85	99	113, 121
21	14	56	—	—	130, 145
20	24	—	—	—	136, 143
19	34	47	—	—	118, 125
18	3	54	—	—	117
13	—	67	86	—	115, 138
0	—	—	—	—	134

Merely a glance at the poems whose percentages are high is enough to identify them as among the most individual in the collection. For this reason they are not readily arranged in groups or classes, and, as wholes, they present no marked similarities to poems further down the list.

But the case is different with the poems whose percentages are low. Here we find a considerable amount of conventionality in expression, as well as general similarities of topic and spirit. In most cases we should naturally call the prevailing style "liturgical," and this designation has so great convenience that it may be adopted, with the proviso, however, that it may need further definition. This general style is not at all confined to the poems that are "weak" in "rare" words. It appears more or less in those that are moderately "strong," but it is there intermingled with other material in such a way that the proportion of "rare" words becomes considerable. In other words, in the middle of the list there are many cases in which passages that are individual and peculiar are closely combined with those that are relatively commonplace or, at least, common in the Psalter.



At all events, the method by which the above summaries are derived justifies us in saying that whatever qualities are dominant in the poems toward the bottom of the list are somewhat characteristic of the Psalter as a whole. What we are here calling "conventional" is that which is so in the Psalter, not in other forms of literature. What this consists in will be seen more clearly in the sequel. If it proves to be like what is ordinary in any literature, it is one thing. But if it is special and unusual, then it is another. In the latter case, the question will at once arise, Is this characteristic feature, or class of features, in the Psalter essential to all Psalter poetry as such, or is it due to conditions incident to the progressive shaping of the collection into its present form? It is clear that discussing this question is likely to shed light upon the history of the book.

It is obvious that the grading of whole poems as to the proportion of "rare" words in them is only the first step in the analysis. If we concede the possibility—rather, the probability—that many or most of the poems are internally composite, we naturally seek for some practicable way of sifting their contents into "strong" and "weak" classes. In some cases it has become customary to recognize divisions of poems into independent sections, as, for example, in 19 and 144. In other cases much difference of opinion exists as to whether or not independent sections are to be considered, and, if so, just what are their limits. The study of this matter is liable to become involved in just those subjective influences that we are here trying to avoid.

But the division of the poems into *verses* seems, on the whole, to be one that can be utilized without much risk of error. Though this division, as intimated through the system of accents and usually made sure by the rhetorical expression of the thought, may be open to some question, it at least far antedates the era of modern criticism, and seems to go back to the period of the editing of the collection. Accordingly, we need not hesitate to experiment with these smallest units to see whether they differ significantly among themselves in regard to the frequency of "rare" words. Through this study we may be able

to get helpful suggestion as to the problem of sections within the poems.

Remembering that normally there is about one "rare" word in every three, and allowing for the varying length of the verses, it appears at once that the 2,455 verses in the Psalter (omitting captions and benedictions) differ much in the proportion of such words. Some are "barren" (devoid of "rare" words) and some are "very weak" (far below the average proportion), while some are "very strong" (much above the average) and a few have so many "rare" words that they may fitly be called "excessive." Between these two extremes lies a large number that are either "normal" or not far above or below it. In this middle class are about two-thirds of the total list of verses. The remaining one-third is about equally divided between "strength" and "weakness."

We at once note that for our purposes the "barren" verses have importance, since in them we find expressions made up wholly of "common" words. The full list of these verses is as follows:—

1 : 6	44 : 5, 8, 9	73 : 25	107 : 1, 8, 15, 21, 31
3 : 3, 5	45 : 18	75 : 10	108 : 2, 6
4 : 7	47 : 3, 7	77 : 14	109 : 2, 21, 26, 27, 31
7 : 2, 11, 18	48 : 2, 9	78 : 3, 39	113 : 1, 2, 4
9 : 2, 11	49 : 20	82 : 6	115 : 1, 3, 5, 8, 15, 16
10 : 6, 11, 16	50 : 6	84 : 5, 9, 13	116 : 2, 9
13 : 6	51 : 17	85 : 7, 8	118 : 1, 6, 7, 8, 17, 21,
14 : 4	52 : 5	86 : 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8	23, 24, 26, 28, 29
16 : 1, 2	53 : 5	88 : 2	119 : 13, 65, 91, 137,
18 : 4, 47, 50	54 : 9	89 : 17, 26, 27, 43	149, 160, 175
20 : 10	55 : 17		120 : 1, 6
21 : 2, 8, 9, 14	56 : 4, 5, 11, 12		121 : 7, 8
22 : 18	57 : 6, 8, 12	90 : 14	122 : 1, 9
24 : 6, 10	59 : 3	92 : 2, 9	123 : 1
25 : 1, 20	62 : 13	94 : 7	125 : 1
26 : 3	63 : 5	95 : 3	128 : 1, 6
27 : 7, 8	64 : 11	96 : 3, 4	130 : 3, 6
29 : 11	65 : 3	97 : 6, 9, 10	134 : 1, 2, 3
30 : 9, 11	66 : 2, 4, 8, 16, 18	99 : 2	135 : 1, 12, 16, 18
31 : 15, 16	67 : 3, 4, 6	101 : 1	136 : 1, 2, 7, 21, 22,
32 : 11	68 : 11	102 : 16	25, 26
33 : 5, 6, 9, 13, 21	69 : 2, 28	103 : 1, 17	138 : 1, 5, 7

34:2, 4, 7, 14, 20	71:1, 19	104:31, 33	143:9, 11
35:24	72:1	105:3, 4, 7	144:3
37:36		106:1, 3, 8, 31, 44	145:1, 2, 10, 17, 21
41:11			146:1, 2, 6
			147:20
			148:1, 4
			149:2

A few of the above verses may be queried because they contain more than one word lying close to the line between the "common" and "rare" classes, viz.: 34:14; 49:20; 89:26; 118:17. Whether a few others should also be queried is a matter of opinion.

With these four verses omitted, the list foots up 220 verses.

Closely related to the "barren" verses are those that we call "very weak"—those in which the proportion of "rare" words is much less than half the normal. The probability is that in these verses whatever characteristics belong to "barren" verses will be more or less apparent. The only difficulty is in drawing the line between verses that shall be called "very weak" and those that ought to be called merely "weak." The list that has been used in this study is as follows:—

3:4, 7	43:3	74:19	108:5
4:2, 4	44:18	76:8	109:16, 28
5:6, 12	46:3, 6, 11	77:2	111:6
6:6	48:11	78:5, 21, 42	112:1, 6, 7, 8
8:5	49:2, 3	79:9, 13	115:12, 18
9:20	50:7, 16	80:18	117:2
10:12, 13	52:11	82:8	118:15
11:7	53:7	84:5, 19	119:43, 62
12:8	55:13, 20	84:3	123:2
14:7	56:14	85:9	125:2, 5
15:1	59:17	86:5, 9, 17	129:8
16:8, 9, 10	60:12	87:5	131:1
17:1, 6	62:8	89:2, 9	135:3, 5, 6, 13, 17, 19, 20
18:25, 28	63:12		138:2, 4
19:2	68:20, 35		139:14, 24
20:2, 7	69:7, 14	90:3, 17	141:8
22:27, 28	70:5	92:10, 12	142:5
23:6	71:20, 24	93:3	143:2, 8
24:2, 3		94:15, 16	145:20
25:2, 11, 15		95:7	146:10
27:2, 9		96:13	148:14
28:3, 9		98:3	
29:3		99:4, 9	

30 : 2, 4, 13	100 : 3, 5
31 : 2, 8, 18, 20	101 : 7
32 : 2	102 : 3, 20
33 : 12	104 : 35
35 : 10, 20	106 : 47
37 : 28	
38 : 17	
41 : 3, 8, 10, 12	

This list might be lengthened considerably by including some verses from the "weak" class. As it stands, it includes 157 verses.

Assuming that these lists are fairly correct, several facts are apparent, some of which may be important for further use. We may well specify the following:—

(a) The proportion of verses almost or quite devoid of "rare" words is large in about one-fifth of the poems (in 3, 4, 16, 20, 21, 24, 30, 41, 53, 56, 67, 84, 86, 99, 100, 112, 113, 115, 117, 118, 123, 125, 128, 131, 134, 135, 138, 143, 146), those (naturally) in which, as poems, the proportion of "rare" words is small. Conversely, about one-third of the poems show a small proportion of such verses, just as they show a large percentage of "rare" words in their total text.

(b) There is marked tendency in the poems to begin or end with verses that are below "normal"—over one-half thus beginning, and nearly two-thirds thus ending. Initial verses are "barren" in thirty-two cases, and "very weak" in twelve more. Final verses are "barren" in twenty-two cases, and "very weak" in twenty-eight more. In many instances the juxtaposition of these verses with their context raises a query about interpolation.

(c) Refrain-verses in 57, 67, 107 are "barren," and in 42-43, 46, 80 are below "normal"; but in 49 they are "very strong."

In general, the results of classifying the poems by the proportion of "rare" words in their total text and by the proportion of verses that range from "strong" to "weak" are the same. But it is important to notice that sometimes in "strong" poems "very weak" or "barren" verses occur, and *vice versa*. If there is any significance in the "rare-word test," such cases provoke special inquiry. Undoubtedly, each case must be considered by itself, and no conclusion should be adopted without regard to parallel cases, if they exist.

If, now, we concentrate our attention upon the "barren" verses, it is manifest at once that they fall into two main classes. A small number are "barren" simply because they happen to

use ordinary terms in the expression of thoughts that derive their main color and force from their general context. A much larger number evidently are "liturgical" in essential character, being such utterances as might occur in a ritual, and embodying expressions that are likely to have become current because of ritual habits. These latter are so numerous that the question arises whether through the analysis of the "barren" verses, which by themselves constitute only 9 % of the Psalter, we may not secure a clue that shall enable us to identify similar material, even outside of these verses. What is attempted here is to trace this matter by means of lexical statistics.

It proves that over 200 of the "common" words occur in "barren" verses, some frequently, some only once or rarely. For our present purpose, the critical point to observe is the proportion of the whole number of the occurrences of a given word that is found in these verses. If a word occurs much more often in "barren" verses than 9 % of all its occurrences, it may be said to "prefer" such verses, which amounts to the same thing as saying that it avoids association with "rare" words. Presumably, also, since the number of "common" words is limited, this also means that words with a high percentage in "barren" verses tend to form parts of more or less conventional expressions that are often repeated or imitated. While the facts may be roughly secured by a mere inspection of the verses, we may well lead up to them by a strictly objective analysis of the statistics. In all cases, we begin with the "barren" verses, but check up the data in the "very weak" verses as well, since these latter are evidently akin to the former.

It proves that in the "barren" verses two words show a percentage over four times as great as we should expect, nine more over three times, thirty-one more over twice, etc.; and almost all of these also show a much higher percentage in "very weak" verses than we should expect. Thus we may isolate a special vocabulary, which is characteristic of the "barren" verses and those like them, a vocabulary made up of "common" words that "prefer" in the Psalter to associate together, entirely or mostly without intermixture with "rare" words.



Also, for reference, we note that among over twenty "common" words *not* found in "barren" verses are *ברית*, *שָׂאוֹל*, *לִבָּב*, *אֶהָל*; and that *סִבֵּב*, *יָרַד*, *תַּחַת*, *חָרֵב*, *שָׁם*, *שָׁבַר* are not found in either "barren" or "very weak" verses.

The distribution of the words in this test-list among the poems proves to be very unequal, as might be expected from the method used in isolating them. In poems having a sustained "liturgical" character they are relatively abundant, while in others they are notably few. Without taking space for the complete summary of the facts, we simply give the beginning and end of the series—those poems in which the proportion of these words is large, and those in which it is small, viz.:

	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
(Many)	—	—	—	—	150
	—	57	—	—	148
	—	67	—	—	136, 138
	—	—	—	—	145
	—	—	—	99	113
	—	—	—	—	115, 134
	24	—	86	97	149
	—	47	—	96	108
	30	54	—	—	118
	20	—	75	—	—
	21	—	—	100	117
	13, 33	52, 63	—	—	111, 135
	9	61	—	—	131
	8	56, 66	—	—	112
	34	48, 71	—	—	146
(Few)	6, 17	42, 51	—	—	141
	23, 41	55	81, 88	—	129, 139
	—	—	—	93	123
	39	53	—	94	132, 137
	1	—	—	—	114
	—	—	—	—	126, 127

The grading in the above table is derived by comparing the number of the test-words in each poem with the total text-length of the poem. *יהוה*, *זֶה*, *אֵת* are omitted from the reckoning, as well as the formulae containing *הָלַל*, *עוֹלָם*, *חֹסֶד*. Greater weight is attached to the occurrences of words near the head of the test-list than of those near its foot.

Thus far the method of analysis used has been as mechanical as possible. But it is evident that now the factor of judgment must enter. For example, we have isolated a group of apparently critical words. But it is unlikely that every occurrence of these words is significant. Where a word has several fairly well

defined usages, the question arises as to which of them is to be emphasized. And it is possible that a few words may appear in the list by a literary accident. Indeed, the securing of the list rests upon the arbitrary distinction made at the outset between "common" and "rare" words. All that could be properly claimed for such a list as this is that it affords a preliminary working hypothesis or clue, the development of which requires both critical tact and the careful weighing of evidence.

Since we are relying upon "barren" verses as indices of a special vocabulary, it follows that only those uses of the words that are emphasized in such verses should be magnified. Below is the summary of the occurrences or uses of the words that appear to the writer to be significant:—

Words referring to jubilant praise: זמר, all; ידה, all; גיל, all, exc. 13:5; הלל, only to God, and exc. "Hallelujah" at opening or close of poems; שמוח, only to God; ברך, only to God; רום, only to or of God; שיר, exc. 65:13; גנר, all, exc. 111:6; 147:19; ספר, only to God; ענה, only to God; תהלה, all.

Words referring to trustful dependence: בטח, only toward God; חסה, all; בקש, only toward God or good things; קרא, only toward God; ריא, only toward God, including Niph. ptc.

Words referring to God Himself, His attributes and deeds: שם, only of God; יהוה, all *omitted*; אדני, all; עליון, all, exc. 89:27; מלך, only of God; מעשה, only of God as Creator, etc.; מרום, only as God's sphere; שמים, only as God's creation or home; צבא, only of heaven; הוא, only of God; גדול, only of God or His works; טוב, only of God or His attributes; קדש, all; חסיד, all; כבוד, only of God, including 3:4; 57:9; 85:10; 108:2; צדקה, only of God; משפט, all, exc. 1:5; 9:5; 17:2; 35:23; 76:10; 112:5; 119:121, 132; 140:13; 143:2; 149:9; חסד, all, exc. 109:12, 16; 141:5, and many formulae, as in 136; פלא, all; ברך, only from God; ענה, only from God; און, only God's; עזר, all, exc. 22:12; 72:12; 107:12; ישע, only by God; ישועה, all; נצל, only by God; חיה, all, exc. 22:30; 49:10; 72:15; 89:49.

Various words, mostly referring to man or his experiences: אדם, all; בשר, only of "mankind," including 56:5; יעקב, all; נחלה, all, exc. 127:3; אשר, all; צרה, all; דור, all; עולם, all, exc. many formulae, as in 136; מי, all. זה, עתה, את, are all *omitted* as of doubtful importance.

When the distribution of these words (in the senses noted) is examined, we find that they are very widely disseminated through the collection, but are more frequent at certain spots than at others. If they afford any historical clue, they represent



some type of expression that affects most of the poems in part and some of them as wholes. Probably the selection of usages and occurrences here used is too liberal, so that single or scattered cases are not important. But where these words occur in relatively large numbers the passages require attention. It proves that about 500 verses contain at least two of these words (about one verse in five), and, of these, nearly 200 contain at least three of them (nearly one verse in twelve). But, inasmuch as the verses vary greatly in length, allowance needs to be made for this fact. In 78 verses these words constitute one-half or more of the text; in 419 verses they constitute one quarter or more. The full list of these is as follows:—

2 : 4	44 : 5, 9	73 : 5, 25, 28	107 : 1, 8, 15, 21, 24, 31, 32,
3 : 5	45 : 3, 18	74 : 12	43
5 : 12	46 : 8, 12	75 : 2, 10	108 : 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11
6 : 5, 6	47 : 3, 7, 8	76 : 2, 8, 9, 11	109 : 21, 26, 30
7 : 1, 18	48 : 2, 12	77 : 8, 9, 14	111 : 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9
9 : 2, 3, 8, 12,	49 : 9, 12, 19	78 : 4, 22, 71	112 : 1, 2, 6
15, 17	50 : 4, 6, 15	79 : 9, 13	113 : 1, 2, 3, 4
10 : 16	51 : 17	80 : 8, 19, 20	115 : 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16
11 : 4	52 : 10, 11	81 : 5, 8	116 : 2, 4, 13, 17
12 : 2, 8	53 : 7	83 : 17	117 : 2
13 : 6	54 : 3, 6, 8, 9	84 : 5, 6, 9, 13	118 : 1, 5, 8, 17, 21, 24, 26,
14 : 7	55 : 17	85 : 6, 7	28, 29
15 : 1	56 : 11	86 : 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,	119 : 7, 13, 26, 39, 40, 52,
17 : 6, 7	57 : 3, 4, 6, 8, 10,	7, 8, 9, 10,	62, 84, 88, 89, 90, 93,
18 : 4, 32, 47,	11, 12	12, 13	120, 142, 144, 145,
50, 51	59 : 3, 18	88 : 10, 11	146, 149, 156, 159,
19 : 2	60 : 7, 11	89 : 2, 3, 5, 15,	160, 164, 175
20 : 2, 7, 10	61 : 5, 8, 9	17, 25, 27,	120 : 1
21 : 2, 8, 14	62 : 3, 7, 13	29, 50	121 : 2
22 : 5, 22, 23	63 : 3, 4, 5		124 : 8
24 : 3, 6, 7, 8,	64 : 10, 11		125 : 1
9, 10	66 : 2, 4, 8, 17, 20	90 : 1, 14	130 : 2, 3
25 : 6, 20	67 : 4, 6, 8	91 : 3, 15	132 : 15
26 : 7	68 : 5, 19, 25, 27,	92 : 2, 3, 5, 9	134 : 2, 3
27 : 7	33, 36	95 : 3, 5, 6	135 : 1, 3, 12, 13
28 : 7, 8, 9	69 : 7, 15, 17, 31,	96 : 1, 2, 3, 4,	136 : 1, 4, 5, 7, 26
29 : 2, 10	33, 35	5, 8, 11	138 : 1, 2, 3, 5, 7
30 : 5, 13	70 : 5	97 : 1, 6, 8, 12	139 : 14
31 : 2, 3, 8, 17,	71 : 1, 2, 16, 17,	98 : 1, 2	140 : 2, 8
22	19	99 : 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	141 : 1
32 : 10, 11	72 : 1, 5	100 : 3, 4, 5	142 : 3

33 : 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 21	101 : 1	143 : 11
34 : 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 18	102 : 13, 19, 20, 22, 26	144 : 15
35 : 9, 17	103 : 1, 6, 17, 21, 22	145 : 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21
36 : 6, 7, 8, 11	104 : 31, 33	146 : 2, 5, 6, 10
37 : 5, 18, 40	105 : 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10	147 : 1, 7, 19, 20
38 : 16	106 : 1, 2, 3, 5, 8,	148 : 1, 2, 3, 5, 13
40 : 4, 6	149 : 1, 2, 3, 9	150 : 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	12, 21, 31, 47	

The distribution of these verses by Books is as follows:—I. 87 vv., 14.1 % (of total vv. in Bk.); II. 76 vv., 16.4 %; III. 52 vv., 14.6 %; IV. 60 vv., 18.8 %; V. 144 vv., 20.5 %.

Among these verses are 41 initial and 41 final verses. The list also includes refrain-verses in 46, 57, 80, 99, 107. In 17 cases these verses have סלה appended, and in 8 more סלה precedes.

So far as the proportion of these verses to the total number of verses in the several poems is a hint that they may belong somewhat completely to the type represented, the most likely cases are, in Bk. I, 24; in Bk. II, 47, 54, 57, 61, 67; in Bk. III, 86; in Bk. IV, 96, 99, 100; in Bk. V, 113, 115, 117, 118, 134, 138, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150. In several cases where poems are made up of two contrasted sections one of these shows a high proportion of these verses, as, for example, 28b, 36b, 102b, 144a.

This class of verses is absent from 26 poems, and very slightly found in several more, especially in 10, 19, 27, 35, 38, 51, 55, 74, 78, 83, 104, 132, 139. But in a very large number of poems there are considerable passages that are absolutely devoid of the words here being studied. The longest of these (each ten verses or more) are 105 : 24-41; 139 : 1-13; 44 : 9-19; 109 : 2-12; 45 : 8-17; 78 : 39-48; but reference to such cases is misleading, since many such "barren" passages are really much longer, the occurrence before or after them of one or two of the critical words being probably without significance. It seems hopeless to discuss the phenomena in detail, since that would involve notes upon the structure of most of the poems in the collection.

Thus far we have been advancing along a single line of induction. We first divided the Psalter vocabulary into two divisions, one of "common" words, the other of "rare" words. We then noted that certain verses are devoid of "rare" words. For these "barren" verses it proved that about one-quarter of the "common" words had a decided "preference," implying that these words had a tendency to appear in conjunction with each other or with other "common" words. After some sifting of the usages of these critical words, we noted certain points

about their distribution through the poems. The next step, obviously, is to remark upon the general critical and historical conclusions toward which these phenomena may be thought to point.

But, before doing this, it is proper to say that several other similar accumulations of statistics might have been introduced. For example, instead of confining ourselves to the "common" words, we might have taken the "moderately rare" words (occurring in 5-12 poems), and noted those that "prefer" verses that are "very weak" or "weak." This would have yielded another critical list of perhaps 70 words. Many of these have unmistakable connection with those already before us. Again, it would be possible to make up another list by massing together the various words that show a marked tendency to associate with the "common" words upon which emphasis has been laid. Still other processes are conceivable.

To introduce further details here would necessitate greatly increasing a statement that is already long and complicated. To the writer this increase seems unnecessary, since, in his opinion, no important new factor would appear, though much that is corroborative of what is here emphasized might be indicated. The principal value of such other studies as have just been suggested has been to him to strengthen the belief that the main method followed has validity and utility. But it is probable that his own interpretations of the material are slightly influenced by facts that are not here given in detail.

The method used in drafting the critical word-list justifies us in supposing that it is connected with some general, widely diffused characteristic of the Psalter. The words that are most "common" must have some correspondence to ideas and sentiments that are pervasive. A minute study of the distribution of these critical words confirms this *à priori* supposition, though, at the same time, it shows that the distribution is not uniform. In some poems the critical words are so many and so scattered that we infer that the whole poem belongs to the class which they represent. In other poems these words are either extremely few or are so oddly disposed in relation to other matter that

we infer either (a) that the whole poem belongs to another class, or (b) that two or more heterogeneous portions have been editorially united, or (c) that detached verses have been inserted into poems that were originally without them.

It is natural to call the type of expression before us "liturgical." It is strongly marked by verbs of liturgical action or sentiment, as well as by many formulae or phrases that suggest liturgical habits or are suitable for actual liturgical application. This is particularly noticeable in the poems in which the critical words are most abundant. We may even observe that this type, as emphasized in the Psalter, has been potent in directing liturgical usage throughout Christian history, serving as both source and model of expression.

Even without going much beyond the range of passages to which our word-list has led us, it is possible to say that this type of expression is associated with certain main concepts or ideas. Its prevailing tone is buoyant and confident, even exuberant. It holds up the notion of God as a supreme King, powerful, glorious and exalted, so imperial as to call forth the height of reverence and adoration, but also a ruler whose relations to men are so benign and generous that He evokes heartfelt trust and loyalty. He is praised not only for what He is, but for what He does, especially for His function as Deliverer and Protector. Yet there is not much sign of definite dwelling upon the particular classes of ill from which He rescues those who trust Him. Neither penitence, nor dejection over misfortune are specially expressed. It is possible to say that there is a tendency to universalistic statements, the sweep of which would probably be lessened if details were magnified. Hence the ease with which most of these expressions can be transferred to all periods and conditions of worship. There is slight explicit reference to history, and hardly any trace of the didactic or homiletic spirit. Whether the term "liturgical" is the best for this type of expression, or whether the foregoing attempt to trace some of its salient qualities is apt, it seems plain that this type has decided individuality, so much so that it becomes a striking factor in the whole problem of the Psalter. Indeed, its existence is universally recognized in commentation,

though its scope and contents are not usually approached in the way here chosen.

Now, for purposes of criticism, it is of much importance to ask whether this type of expression, with all that it involves, is so inherent in the whole of the literary output that gave rise to Psalter poetry as to be simply an aspect of it, or whether it represents one stage or period in the development of that poetry.

It seems to the writer that the weight of evidence is on the side of the latter supposition. At least, it seems worth while to test this supposition as carefully as possible. Accordingly, we now take up some facts that make it plausible.

At later points in these Studies it will be argued that, by processes analogous to that here used, it is possible to designate two or three other distinct types of expression in the Psalter, each with its own characteristic vocabulary, phraseological tendency, and general thought-content. Although recognizing the possibility of regarding all these as purely psychological aspects of the general impulse that called forth all Psalter poetry, the writer has come to feel that for these contrasted aspects of thought and sentiment it is natural and necessary to conjecture varying historic conditions and hence to conjecture for them some chronological sequence. This special line of investigation, then, connects itself with all the various efforts, which are almost universal in recent commentation, to draft a hypothesis as to how the Psalter was progressively built up out of groups of material that originated at different times, perhaps separated by considerable intervals, and under different conditions, perhaps somewhat opposed in character.<sup>4</sup>

In a general way, the mere fact of the diffusion of this "liturgical" material in the Psalter favors the presumption that it is comparatively late, or, at least, belongs to the time of the final editing rather than to any earlier time, if such time is

<sup>4</sup> Throughout the present discussion the writer has not undertaken to give references to the innumerable points of connection between the matters here presented and the great body of modern commentaries, simply because of the magnitude of such an effort and because, for those familiar with the literature, it is needless.

to be provided for, when were drafted certain poems that remained in use in such a way as ultimately to demand inclusion in the collection. It is not likely that a pervading element would belong to any but one of the later stages of a prolonged process of accumulation. Yet this argument is manifestly not of great force, certainly by itself.

In a general way, also, the fact that this material is "liturgical" in just the way it is may be regarded as associating it with the later stages of the process of making a service-book for some sort of practical use. The Psalter cannot be supposed to be simply a poetic anthology, compiled for literary purposes, nor simply a book of devotional readings. The preservation of its materials, the sifting of them, their shaping into their present form, and, finally, their adoption into the recognized canon, presuppose that they were associated with some stated religious use that gave them exceptional importance, dignity, and even sanctity. With all this agrees the evidence of the various rubrics and captions that accompany the poems. If, then, we are dealing with a body of liturgical literature, we should expect that running through the whole would be strains that are "liturgical." If we go further, and suppose that the whole collection is made up of poems consciously composed for a liturgical use of some definite sort, then we may even say that the case calls for no argument whatever, since, of course, the purpose would declare itself throughout. It is very doubtful, however, whether we are in any position to say just what was the primary purpose of this type of poetry, certainly to say it with such positiveness and definiteness as to permit us to hold that what we are now considering is an inevitable feature of the whole process. Until we are sure of our history we must be careful about presuppositions. In this case we are forced to rely largely upon internal evidence for our historical hypotheses, and it is begging the question to assume that which is to be proved.

We are probably assisted to a just conclusion by certain facts. It is clear that the type of expression to which our test-list of words points is most fully exemplified in Bks. IV-V, especially in the series 96-100 in the former, and in the two

Hallels in the latter. If it were not for the inclusion in these books of certain poems that are more or less unique (and which, therefore, present distinct problems by themselves), like 90, 91, 104, 119, 137, 139, with the whole series known as "Songs of Ascents," and representatives of classes elsewhere prominent (such as 94, 101, 105, 106, 114, 140, 141), these Books would show an overwhelming preponderance of this type of expression as compared with other Books. By general consent, the so-called "Greek Hallel" (146-150) is counted as late, and it is just here that our test-words are remarkably numerous. By general consent, also, the doxologies that are appended to Bks. I-IV are late, and these, if they had been included in our enumeration, would have been "strong" in the test-words.

Again, we note that several poems, outside of Bks. IV-V, present such lexical affinities with the poems within these Books that exemplify the type of expression before us that we may well suppose them to belong to the same general class. Striking instances are 24b, most of 33, 47, 57, much of 66, 67, 86, besides sections or passages elsewhere. All these offer such contrasts in both form and content to their surroundings as to suggest that they have been interpolated into the series where they stand. If this be plausible, then the type they represent must be subsequent to the type or types with which they are in contrast.

Again, a similar remark applies to the numerous cases in which initial or final verses, either of whole poems or of somewhat distinct sections, present our characteristic type of expression. These seem to be *imposed* upon the main structure of the poems in many cases, often with an apparent purpose to make the latter either more generally useful or less objectionable (by a "euphemistic" coloring).<sup>5</sup>

The most plausible cases are 7:18; 9:2-3; 13:6-7; 14:7 = 53:7; 18:50-51; 20:10; 21:14; 28:6-9; 29:1-2, 10-11; 30:13; 32:10-11; 34:2-5; 45:18; 48:2; 52:10-11; 59:17-18; 63:12; 64:10-11; 66:16-20; 68:36; 72:17; 73:28; 75:2, 10; 79:13; 80:19 (final before refrain); 83:19; 84:13; 89:2-3; 92:2-5; 101:1; 105:1-2; 106:1-3, 47; 109:30-31;

<sup>5</sup> See Grimm: *Euphemistic Appendices*, pp. 8, 22.

with many others that are uncertain. Note that only a very few of these lie in Bks. IV-V. If among these are instances of imposed antiphons, the implication is that the process of emendation affected Bks. I-III, which, therefore, were earlier in existence.

Probably a similar remark might be made about refrain-verses, though the number of clear instances is small.

The best cases for our theory are 42(-43), 46, 80, 107. In 57 the refrains seem to be simply a part of the general texture. In 42 one may argue forcibly that the refrains (like the interpolated Yahwistic v. 9) are euphemistic in intent.

Whatever be the etymological sense of סלה, it is clear that in a great majority of cases it serves to mark a separation between sections—somewhat equivalent in effect to the modern typographical device of inserting extra “leads,” perhaps with a “rule,” so that the eye is immediately guided to the intended partition of the text. One is led to wonder whether in some cases it is not the sign of an insertion or similar interference in the text. If so, the verses preceding and following may be regarded as initials or finals.

In the lists on pp. 88 f. the following verses are *succeeded* by סלה: 3:5; 9:17; 24:6, 10; 44:9; 46:8, 12; 50:6; 57:4; 61:5; 66:4; 68:33; 81:8; 84:5, 9; 88:11; 89:5—all, naturally, in Bks. I-III, since the use of this term is almost confined to these Books. In the LXX the term is also appended to 50:15; 80:8.

The following verses are *preceded* by סלה: 54:6; 57:8; 60:7; 66:8; 67:6; 76:11; 84:6; 89:50.

In a number of cases the poems of the collection have the look of being compounded of two or more sections of diverse character. Judgments may differ widely as to the exact limits of these, and still more as to the theory to account for them. For purposes of rough comparison, however, we may safely note some examples as tending to support the general argument before us. Fully to discuss the facts would require far more space than is available.

The percentages in the following table show the proportion of the test-words to the text-length of the sections indicated:



8: a. 2-4	19 %	36: a. 2-5	0 %	90: a. 1-12	7 %
b. 5-16	4 „	b. 6-13	18 „	b. 13-17	8 „
c. 17-25	5 „	42: a. 2-5, 7-8, 10-11	0 %	102: a. 2-12	4 %
d. 26-46	5 „	b. 6, 9, 12	11 „	b. 13-23	15 „
e. 47-51	25 „	44: a. 2-9	15 %	c. 24-29	11 „
9: a. 2-7	10 %	b. 10-27	2 „	106: a. 1-5, 47	29 %
b. 8-15	4 „	50: a. 1-15	9 %	b. 6-46	5 „
12: a. 2-12	13 %	b. 16-23	2 „	108: a. 2-6 (= 57)	30 %
b. 13-22	4 „	60: a. 3-6	0 %	b. 7-14 (= 60)	11 „
c. 23-32	13 „	b. 7-11	12 „	108: a. 1-20	2 %
17: a. 1-6	8 %	c. 12-14	10 „	b. 21-31	18 „
b. 7-14	6 „	74: a. 1-11	4 %	144: a. 1-11	12 %
18: a. 1-5	5 %	b. 12-23	5 „	b. 12-15	5 „
b. 6-9	27 „	89: a. 2-5	28 %		
19: a. 1-2, 10-11	22 %	b. 6-19	6 „		
b. 3-9	4 „	c. 20-38	15 „		
		d. 39-52	5 %		

Although these data are not uniformly clear, their general trend is that sections that are likely to be the earlier are weaker in test-words, and *vice versa*. But it may be that other factors than those now before us enter into the problem in some cases.

There is another line of argument, which is hard to carry out in full, and the exact bearing of which is open to debate, but which, nevertheless, should be mentioned. Some thirty of the test-words are very unequally distributed through the Old Testament books, at least in the senses noted. On the whole, the evidence favors the general view here emphasized. No doubt, some cases are to be explained by supposing that the Psalms are directly influenced by the knowledge and use of antecedent literature. But, especially as regards the words of praise, there is room for the supposition that in some cases "liturgical" antiphons have been inserted in antecedent texts, just as such antiphons seem to have been inserted in certain Psalms. If this latter supposition is correct, even in a comparatively few instances, it has a bearing upon the date of such emendations in general, since, whatever view may be held as to the *terminus ad quem* in the process of text-alteration

that is supplied by the LXX for the Psalter, it cannot well be as late nor as uncertain for the Pentateuch or the Prophecies.

Without venturing to give great weight to this matter it is worth while to give some statistics, as they concern this discussion. It is plain, however, that there may be much difference of opinion as to just what passages should be cited under particular usages of the words. The figures of the following table

	Gn	Ex	Lv	Nu	Dt	Jos	Jg	Sa	Kg	Is <sup>1</sup>	Is <sup>2</sup>	Jer	Ezk	Ho	Jl	Am
זמר	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
חסיד	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
חסה	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	—
ידה	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	5	—	1	—	—	—	—
עליון	4	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
רום	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	4	2	4	2	—	—	—	—	—
חסר	5	4	—	2	3	—	—	5	3	—	5	5	—	1	1	—
הלל	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	4	3	—	—	—	—
פלא	—	2	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
אשר	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	2	2	1	—	—	—	—	—
ישועה	1	2	—	—	1	—	—	4	—	8	11	—	—	—	—	—
גדול	—	2	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	1	—	—	—
מלך	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	3	5	—	—	—	—
תהלה	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	11	5	—	—	—	—
קרא	5	—	—	—	4	—	2	2	4	1	6	5	1	1	2	—
ברך	4	1	—	—	1	1	2	4	7	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
צדקה	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	1	—	5	13	2	—	—	—	—
גיל	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	6	—	—	1	2	—
מרום	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	2	—	—	—	—
עור	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—
בטח	—	—	—	—	1	—	5	—	9	5	4	16	2	1	—	1
און	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	2	2	1	1	—	1	—	—	—
שמח	—	—	1	—	8	—	—	5	2	3	3	4	—	—	2	1
שמים	13?	4	—	—	6	1	—	2	18	1	15	4	2	—	2	—
שיר	—	3	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	2	1	1	1	—	—	—
צרה	3	—	—	—	2	—	1	4	2	3	3	8	—	—	—	—
כבוד	—	9	2	6	1	1	—	4	1	6	12	4	19	2	—	—
בקש	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	3	2	—	4	—	1
בשר	12?	—	—	3	2	—	—	—	—	—	6	4	4	—	1	—
צבא	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	4	56	6	82	—	1	—	9

represent a careful attempt to sift the occurrences of each word under the restrictions of meaning given on p. 94.

In the table the words are taken in the order of the ratios between the number of occurrences within the Psalter and the total number outside of it. The first sixteen words all occur more times (in the senses considered) in the Psalter than in all the other books together. The last two words are much more frequent in the other books than in the Psalter.

Ob	Jon	Mi	Na	Hb	Zp	Hg	Zc	Mal	Pr	Job	Ru	La	Dn	Ezr	Neh	Chr	Ps
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	41
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	25
—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	25
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	3	11	67
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	21
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	33
—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	2	2	2	1	3	4	10	127
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	18	61
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	2	—	1	—	—	28
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	1	—	—	1	—	—	2	26
—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	2	45
—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	1	—	4	1	25
—	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	19
—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	29
—	4	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	6	—	1	—	—	—	3	51
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	5	—	—	4	1	3	11	47
—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	29
—	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	11
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	13
—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	10	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	46
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	2	3	11
1	—	1	—	—	1	—	3	—	13	1	—	2	—	2	3	8	39
—	1	—	—	1	—	2	1	1	2	6	—	4	—	1	—11	10	60
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	6	17	14	26
2	1	—	2	1	1	—	1	—	7	2	—	—	1	—	2	2	24
—	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	34
—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2	1	1	—	—	—	1	3	—	8	11
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	1	4
—	—	1	2	1	2	—	14	53	24	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	16

In this table, no account is made of the doublets in Is. 36-38a and in Chr. with passages already noted in Kgs. בִּרְךְ is taken only when addressed to God, and צִבְּא only when in divine titles.

As examples of the peculiar distribution of these words among the several books, note that in Gen. about one-half of the cases are in chs. 9, 14, 24, 49; in Ex. two-thirds of the cases are in chs. 15, 16, 20, 33, 34 (15 alone has over one-quarter); in Num. over one-third are in ch. 14, and one-quarter more in chs. 11, 16; in Deut. two-thirds are in chs. 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 26, 32, 33 (nearly one-quarter in the last two); in Is<sup>1</sup>, out of 61 cases (omitting צִבְּא), 31 are in chs. 12 (9 cases), 25, 26, 30, 33, with 18 more in chs. 5, 6, 14, 24, 35, 38b, while there are none whatever in chs. 15-23; in Mic., out of 11 cases, 7 are in ch. 7, 2 in ch. 6, and 1 each in chs. 4, 5; in Hab. 5 out of 8 cases are in ch. 3 (poem); etc.

If we disregard צִבְּא, and allow for the varying length of the books, Is<sup>2</sup> shows decidedly the largest proportions of these words (in the meanings considered), followed by Neh., Prov., Is<sup>1</sup>, Jer., Ezra, Job, Chr., and Deut., in rapidly decreasing proportions.

It remains to say that the whole view of the material here presented needs to be brought into connection with other material to be set forth in later divisions of these Studies. In particular, no good conclusions can be reached regarding the "liturgical" material without examining its relations to the materials characteristic of the "David" poems. Something also depends upon the view taken of the materials characteristic of the Elohist poems. Hence it is necessary to extend the method to these other fields.